

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2010, claims 1 – 18 were rejected. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 15 and files herewith a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments, the RCE, and the below-provided remarks. No claims are added or canceled.

Interview Summary

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for allowing Applicant a telephonic interview on February 23, 2010, to discuss the claims of the present application. Applicant presented an amendment to claim 1. Agreement was reached that the amendment would overcome the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Applicant agreed to file the amendment and an RCE.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1-3, 9, and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Liu et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,219,797, hereinafter Liu). Additionally, claims 4-8 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu. Additionally, claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of the Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA). However, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over Liu and the AAPA for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to particularly point out that the data pattern is representative of a sequence of two or more frequencies. Support for the amendment is found in Applicants' specification at, for example, paragraphs [0009] and [0030].

Applicant respectfully requests examination of claim 1 in view of the above-identified amendment.

Independent Claim 15

Applicant has amended claim 15 to include similar limitations to claim 1. Here, although the language of claim 15 differs from the language of claim 1 and the scope of claim 15 should be interpreted independently of claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above in regard to the rejection of claim 1 also apply to the rejection of claim 15.

Dependent Claims 2-14 and 16-18

Claims 2-14 and 16-18 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claims 1 and 15. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2-14 and 16-18 are allowable at least based on allowable base claims. Additionally, each of claims 2-14 and 16-18 may be allowable for further reasons, as described below.

In regard to claims 9 and 14, Applicant has pointed out in the response to the previous Office Action, mailed November 23, 2009, that the Office Action fails to explain why the claimed limitations of claims 9 and 14 would have been anticipated by Liu. However, the current Office Action still fails to explain why the claimed limitations of claims 9 and 14 would have been anticipated by Liu, because the Office Action does not acknowledge the actual language of claims 9 and 14. In particular, the Office Action fails to acknowledge that claim 9 recites that the “data pattern is derived from, or comprises, a series of requests for a change of frequency of said clock signal” (emphasis added). Additionally, the Office Action fails to acknowledge that claim 14 recites that the device is “arranged and configured to temporarily disconnect all of the clock generation elements from the clock output, in response to a request to do so” (emphasis added). In fact, the Office Action does not even make an assertion that the cited references might disclose the indicated limitation. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 9 is not anticipated by Liu because Liu does not disclose that the “data pattern is derived from, or comprises, a series of requests for a change of frequency of said clock signal,” as recited in claim 9. Additionally, Applicant respectfully asserts that

claim 14 is not anticipated by Liu because Liu does not disclose a device “arranged and configured to temporarily disconnect all of the clock generation elements from the clock output, in response to a request to do so,” as recited in claim 14.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 50-4019 pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account 50-4019 under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: February 23, 2010

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111